**Chapter 6 - Internal Disagreements**

As stated, 'Hever Rabbinim' was established within the framework of the Hapoel Ha Mizrachi movement. That is why the rabbis who were members of the Hever HaRabbanim were the rabbis of Religious Zionism. At the same time, the fact that the Hever HaRabbanim was part of a particular political body and was affiliated with a distinct Religious Zionist ideology did not prevent it from being a powerful body. Hever HaRabbanim's ability to bring together hundreds of rabbis under its auspices made it a significant and powerful organization in the rabbinical world, when no decision of the chief rabbinate could be made without it, especially regarding the appointment of rabbis to different settlements.In this regard, Rabbi Yaakov Ariel says, "Hever HaRabbanim made sure that wherever there was a need for a rabbi, a rabbi would be appointed from its ranks. They would locate the candidate, present him to the Ministry of Religion, and then ask the Ministry of Religion to appoint the rabbi whom they recommended. And that is how it came about that rabbis were appointed through Hever HaRabbanim.”[[1]](#footnote-1)

Below we will address one of the problematic issues that preoccupied Hever HaRabbanim from the very beginning but especially since the 1960s: the constant dilemma of both being an organization connected to a party and working within its framework and on its behalf, and of being a national organization that should not necessarily act as the agent of Religious Zionism. The dilemma was constant and ongoing, but in the 1950s the activity in the field decided in favor of moving in the national direction. The 1960s, with the change in the general situation, saw the beginning of a significant discussion of the issue. One of the reasons offered for the decline of Hever HaRabbanim in the 1970s is the internal dilemma that was at the heart of its activities–a dilemma it was never able to resolve.

One of the decisions made by Hever HaRabbanim at the very first convention in 1948 was the establishment of a national body that would unite all the rabbis in Eretz Israel: "In light of the major questions in religious Judaism and its status in the State of Israel, the convention turns to the Chief Rabbinate with an urgent request to establish a nation-wide organization of all the rabbis of Eretz Israel.”[[2]](#footnote-2)   It is not difficult to hypothesize that the reason that already in 1948, Hever HaRabbanim saw the need to establish a national organization of rabbis was the fact that Hever HaRabbanim itself, which was established within the framework of a political movement, could not unite within it all the rabbis including the rabbis from the ultra-Orthodox sector. That national organization was never established. Hever HaRabbanim continued to function as a strong organization, with the number of rabbis who belonged to it only increasing over the years.[[3]](#footnote-3)

As a result of the frustration among Agudat Israel members, whose rabbis did not belong to the strongest rabbinical body in the country, i.e., Hever HaRabbanim, for ideological reasons, an alternative body called "Agudat Rabbinim" was established in the early 1960s.[[4]](#footnote-4)  This organization was supposed to be an alternative to Hever HaRabbanim and to unite all the rabbis in the country. Approximately 400 rabbis from all sectors (mainly Ashkenazi rabbis) became members of this body.[[5]](#footnote-5) One of the personalities who surprisingly joined the new rabbinical organization was Rabbi Shaul Yisraeli, one of the founders of Hever Rabbinim. This might have signaled the first cracks that began to appear in Hever HaRabbanim between Rabbi Tchorsh and Rabbi Yisraeli, as we will see below.

The chief rabbi of Tel Aviv, Rabbi Isser Yehuda Unterman, and the chief rabbi of Petah Tikva, Rabbi Reuven Katz, were elected presidents of Agudat HaRabbanim. Both of these rabbis were identified with Religious Zionism, and this expressed a kind of criticism of Hapeol HaMizrachi's rabbinical organization as a body that was identified very prominently as political. They stated that the new rabbinical organization had no partisan or political orientation, and that its purpose was to "strengthen the standing of the rabbis, to increase esteem of religion and morality, and to safeguard all religious matters.[[6]](#footnote-6) The patterns of action established for the Agudat HaRabbanim recall those of Hever HaRabbanim, such as regular gatherings, administrative meetings, and letters and press releases.[[7]](#footnote-7)

As was the case with Hever HaRabbanim, there was a fear that the establishment of the new organization would harm the Chief Rabbinate, and Rabbi Unterman allayed this concern by stating that "Agudat HaRabbanim be able to work in harmony with the Chief Rabbinate, as it stands on a solid and firm foundation.”[[8]](#footnote-8)

The establishment of Agudat HaRabbanim presented Hever HaRabbanim with the dilemma it had faced ever since its inception, and which it now had to address: is it acting as a political body or as a national organization? The criticism leveled at it by ultra-Orthodox circles, contending that it was operating within narrow party limits, required formulation of an action policy.

At the seventh convention of Hever HaRabbanim held in Iyar 5720 (1960), shortly after the founding of the Agudat HaRabbanim, Rabbi Tchorsh related in detail to the very essence of Hever HaRabbanim:

*And to those on the outside it says: We do not turn a blind eye, because Hever HaRabbanim is made up of rabbis who are within the movement. However, the general trend of the association goes beyond the narrow party framework. We see before us not only the main work within the movement and its missions, but also the common good and the public, for the purpose of establishing and stabilizing the state on the foundations of the Torah and its sacred treasures. Because the greatness [of having] the state is part of our very being and our soul. And it is incumbent upon us in our actions to do everything to achieve the ultimate goal that we have set for ourselves, at the very beginning of the movement: the Land of Israel and the people of Israel according to the Torah of Israel.”[[9]](#footnote-9)*

Rabbi Tchorsh had put his finger on the dilemma facing Hever HaRabbanim, namely, on the one hand, being committed to the movement, but on the other, working "for the common good and the public." Rabbi Tchorsh did not actually resolve the dilemma, but only tried to say that despite the fact Hever HaRabbanim was part of a political movement, it was still committed to the common good.

After that, Rabbi Tchorsh addressed the claims according to which the Hever HaRabbanim acted in a discriminating manner in appointing rabbis to settlements and gave preference rabbis who belonged to the party over rabbis who were not connected to Religious Zionism:

*However, let this be clear, that we cannot rule out bringing in rabbis in our locales where all the residents are members of our movement, in outlook and ideology, in work and in deed. Let them also match this spirit and this view, because outside of the logical reasoning: that one must act in accord with one's environment, there is no point in imposing upon them rabbis who are opposed to this spirit and worldview, just as it would be hard to imagine putting the Mizrahi or HaPoel HaMizrahi rabbi in places like "Komemiyut" or "Hafetz Chaim"…*

 The argument that Rabbi Tchorsh tenders is a clear avoidance of addressing head-on the essence of the rabbinical community.  According to Rabbi Tchorsh's claim, the fact that the Hever HaRabbanim preferred rabbis identified with Religious Zionism is not related to the fact that the Hever HaRabbanim was a partisan body. Rabbi Tchorsh explained that the reason for this was purely demographic and objective: in other words, the fact that those settlements where Hever Rabbanim rabbis were appointed were mostly populated by religious and Zionist residents.  In this way, Rabbi Tchorsh tried to refute the claims that Hever HaRabbanim was a partisan body and despite being part of the Mafdal, its activity was non-partisan.

In the continuation of Rabbi Tchorsh's speech, which dealt mainly with this topic, there is a reference to the subject of establishing a national rabbinical body. Rabbi Tchorsh did not oppose this; indeed, he claimed, and justly so, that already at the beginning of Hever HaRabbanim's establishment, this issue was mentioned in its resolutions. In mentioning this, Rabbi Tchorsh tried to reject the claims that Hever HaRabbanim opposed the establishment of a nationwide rabbinic body.

Rabbi Tchorsh also referred to Agudat HaRabbanim that was established a short time before, and it seems that all his words so far were directed at this point. As he said, "If it turns out that the directors of this organization have their eyes on the aforementioned direction, that is: to unite, consolidate, and organize all the rabbis of the country… there is no doubt that we will fully participate in it." What Rabbi Tchorsh said was "if it turns out", however, he expressed his clear-cut opinion about the intentions of the founders of Agudat HaRabbanim:

*We had well-founded doubts at the very beginning of this organization, that there seems to an intention here to harm Hever HaRabbanim as an organization, and the rabbis who are organized within it. This is because within the organizing committee, not a single rabbi who is a member of Hever HaRabbanim was invited. The content of the arguments of the rabbis who spearheaded the establishment of the organization was also accompanied by a general tone of opposition to Hever HaRabbanim and our movement.*

According to Rabbi Tchorsh, the intentions of the founders of Agudat HaRabbanim were not pure. In his opinion, the reason underlying the establishment of the Agudat HaRabbanim was to undercut Hever HaRabbanim, and not for the purpose of truly establishing a national rabbinical organization. For the same reason, Rabbi Tchorsh attacked the "non-partisanship" that Agudat HaRabbanim ascribed to itself, which according to Rabbi Tchorsh was not genuine.

Agudat HaRabbanim, as mentioned, had tasked the Hever HaRabbanim with the need to discuss itself. In other words, they had to determine whether it was their intention to act as a rabbinical body without partisan tendencies or perhaps, the fact that it was part of a political party could not be ignored?

References to this topic in the Hever HaRabbanim can also be seen in the Shvilin issues that began to be published in 1962. Already in the first issue that was published in Adar 2 of that year, Rabbi Tchorsh writes:

*We founded the organization–Hever HaRabbanim –not out of partisan intentions but out of full recognition that the rabbinical community that is loyal to the Torah and the state will be able to find a faithful helper in the form of a national-religious party that raises the banner of loyalty to the Torah and the state. And even though from an organizational point of view, we are organized in the Histadrut Hapoel HaMizrachi* [labor union]*, which is close to our hearts and souls, we are ready and willing to cooperate with anyone who is loyal to the Torah and the state, to be a bridge between the two. In this respect, we are also ready to lend a hand to a national organization of rabbis whose guiding policy will be loyal to the Torah and the state and to enhance the power of the Chief Rabbinate of Israel.[[10]](#footnote-10)*

Here one can identify a different approach by Rabbi Tchorsh to the issue of the identity of Hever HaRabbanim and to the dilemma it faced. Rabbi Tchorsh tried to solve the problematic nature of his belonging to the party by arguing that Hever HaRabbanim was established within a party framework but not with partisan intentions. In addition, Rabbi Tchorsh clarified that although from an organizational point of view Hever HaRabbanim was related to the Mafdal, Hever HaRabbanim would cooperate with anyone imbued with loyalty to the Torah and the state. Yet Rabbi Tchorsh's argument effectively ruled out the possibility of ultra-Orthodox participation in Hever HaRabbanim. A statement whereby Hever HaRabbanim will cooperate with anyone– only on the condition that it identifies itself with the state and the Chief Rabbinate, in effect, excludes the ultra-Orthodox from being allowed to be partners in Hever HaRabbanim. So while on the one hand, Rabbi Tchorsh tried to claim that Hever HaRabbanim was a national organization, on the other, he did not remove Hever HaRabbanim from the framework of the Religious-Zionist movement.

In that first issue of 'Shvilin', there is a direct reference to the Agudat Rabbinim.  This is interesting, because two additional criticisms are mentioned here that were not mentioned previously regarding Agudat HaRabbanim. The first refers to the fact that the Sephardi rabbis were not part of it:

*Unfortunately, the inclusive nature of this association has been hurt, both due to the refusal to include our brothers the Sephardi rabbis at this stage. And because of the affront to the honor of rabbis who are serving in rabbinical positions, that for some reason, the right to vote and be elected to the association's institutions was taken away from them.[[11]](#footnote-11)*

It seems that the rabbis from *Edot HaMizrach* [Jews of the Eastern communities and Sephardim], most of whom were members of the Hever HaRabbanim, were rejected by the Agudat HaRabbanim, which led to criticism from the former. It is also possible that some Ashkenazi rabbis who were members of Hever HaRabbanim were rejected by Agudat HaRabbanim.[[12]](#footnote-12)

It is interesting that the second criticism directed at the Agudat HaRabbanim resonated the criticism of Hever HaRabbanim alluded to by Rabbi Nissim (which we discussed earlier), concerning the parallel areas of activity between it and the Chief Rabbinate:

*Moreover: Agudat HaRabbanim, which was established between elections, must not try to take over areas that are under the exclusive authority of the Chief Rabbinate.*

Here Hever HaRabbanim was called upon to attack Agudat HaRabbanim because of its infringement, as he saw it, on the Chief Rabbinate.  Apparently, the fact that Agudat HaRabbanim identified itself with the ultra-Orthodox sector led to disregard of the Chief Rabbinate of Israel, which brought on this criticism from Hever HaRabbanim.

In any case, the establishment of Agudat HaRabbanim continued to present the Hever HaRabbanim with the challenge to justify its being part of a political party on the one hand, and carrying out national activity on the other. At the eighth convention of Hever HaRabbanim, Rabbi Tchorsh spoke again about the internal paradox underlying Hever HaRabbanim:

*It should be emphasized that Hever HaRabbanim does not intend to break off and separate itself from the rabbinical community in our country. The very essence of HaMizrahi movement and HaPoel HaMizrahi has always been cooperation with all sectors of the public and in the general social trend, our trend is:inclusion and expansion.[[13]](#footnote-13)*

Rabbi Tchorsh emphasized that the fact that Hever HaRabbanim was part of a party does not show that is separatist and isolationist but the opposite. The mission of Religious Zionism is to be a partner with all parts of the public. Later in his remarks, Rabbi Tchorsh said that "the partisan element in Hever HaRabbanim provides a basis and framework for its broad and well-developed activities." Rabbi Tchorsh had an interesting claim; he stated that the fact that Hever HaRabbanim was part of the Mafdal was not a problem of partisanship, but the opposite. It is precisely the path of Religious Zionism that provides the basis for broad activity with all sectors of the public.

Indeed, Hever HaRabbanim never neglected the fact of being part of the Mafdal, and especially part of the HaPoel HaMizrachi. Rabbi Tchorsh was quoted in this issue praising the way of the HaPoel HaMizrachi compared to the "separatist" Agudat Israel, as he defined it, and it seems that his words were spoken against the background of the struggle around the Hever HaRabbanim.[[14]](#footnote-14) Hever HaRabbanim was not a body that gained momentum, and it seems that it declined even before it had time to accumulate strength.

In any case, the claims voiced against Hever HaRabbanim, that it was acting out of narrow partisan tendencies, was probably the weak link during its period of activity. It is not surprising that it took pains to emphasize constantly that this was not the case, as had been written about Hever HaRabbanim's attitude to the Chief Rabbinate: "It has no interest or thoughts of narrow partisanship. Its pure intention is to raise the value of this institution and consequently to uplift and glorify the status of the Torah.”[[15]](#footnote-15)

The religious weekly *Panim-el-panim* covered the national convention of the Hever HaRabbanimin in Sivan 5723-1973, and expressed appreciation for the power of Hever HaRabbanim, along with criticism of its being a partisan rabbinical body:

*One of the most popular institutions of the Mafdal is its Hever HaRabbanim. Even those who are opposed, on principle, to rabbinical organizations of a partisan nature are willing to admit the great positiveness inherent in the work of Hever HaRabbanim ... thanks to a number of active rabbis who understand the challenges of the day, Hever HaRabbanim has become an authoritative institution. It also showed quite diverse activity in different directions... Thus, when the traditional national convention of Hever HaRabbanim convened at the beginning of this week and its five hundred members filled the hall to overflowing, the chairman Rabbi Tchorsh, was able to give them a fascinating account of the activities of Hever HaRabbanim.”[[16]](#footnote-16)*

And despite the popularity and success of Hever HaRabbanim, the opinion that it was acting out of narrow partisan intentions had also begun to permeate the ranks of Hever HaRabbanim itself, mainly from the direction of Rabbi Shaul Yisraeli. This is actually where the beginning of the rift in the rabbinical community lies, intertwined with the complex relationship between Hever HaRabbanim and the Chief Rabbinate, and especially with Rabbi Unterman, which we discussed earlier. However, the differences of opinion in the rabbinical community did not focus only on the issue of partisanship. In following we will deal with another topic that was in dispute within Hever HaRabbanim: Hever HaRabbanim as a "professional union" of the rabbis.

\*\*\*\*

The rabbis, who serve in different settlements throughout the country, be they rabbis of cities, moshavim or even neighborhoods, function as subordinate to their superiors: religious councils, municipalities, local councils, and regional councils, and they operate under the auspices of the Chief Rabbinate of Israel. Because of this, it is natural for them to be organized in a professional union to protect their professional rights, like the "Teachers' Union" or the "Doctors' Union".

At the same time, there was a fundamental problem in defining the Hever HaRabbanim as a "professional union", because it was not established for this specific purpose like other workers' organizations. Moreover, Hever HaRabbanim was established as a rabbinical body that was supposed to deal with spiritual matters. The very definition of a rabbinical body that is supposed to deal with matters of social benefits is a fundamental problem, especially in a body like the Hever HaRabbanim whose main purpose when it was established.was to contribute to the spiritual aspect of the country.

From an analysis of the references within Hever HaRabbanim, one can identify two approaches that differ in their attitude as to how to deal with the rabbis' social rights and that reflect the problematic nature of Hever HaRabbanim as a professional union.  One approach is that of Rabbi Shaul Yisraeli, and the other is that of Rabbi Kathariel Fishel Tchorsh. These two rabbis were the ones who actually founded the Hever HaRabbanim, and this is also the source of the deep rift that opened up within the main rabbinic organization in the state at that time. It should be noted that they do not refer directly to the subject, which is mentioned only tangentially in a small number of references.  At the same time, the striking difference between the two approaches is clear and leaves no room for doubt as to its existence. To sharpen the point, there was no disagreement between them regarding the need for Hever HaRabbanim to engage in Torah-related and halachic matters; the question that was at stake was whether to also engage in "labor union" matters.

Rabbi Yisraeli spoke at the eighth convention of Hever HaRabbanim convened on 12 Sivan 5723 -1963, and among other subject, he expressed his opinion of the purpose of Hever HaRabbanim:

*It is certainly possible to say that our public, which is united in the rabbinical association called "Hever HaRabbanim", is not a professional union in essence. It was not the goal of improving material conditions that united the founding members, nor is it the line that distinguishes the "member" from the other organizations. The one and only goal that is fundamentally set forth is: we all accept upon ourselves the yoke of heavenly sovereignty from one another…[[17]](#footnote-17)*

Rabbi Yisraeli stated categorically that Hever HaRabbanim was not a professional union and that it must act only in spiritual areas. His main argument was that this was not the reason for its establishment in the beginning. In the festschrift for Rabbi Yisraeli "*Gaon BaTorah UMidot*", it was explicitly written that "Rabbi Yisraeli always called for emphasizing the content aspect of the activities of Hever HaRabbanim.”[[18]](#footnote-18)

In contrast with Rabbi Yisraeli, Rabbi Tchorsh saw no problem in dealing with professional union matters as well, in addition to the other Torah matters. In the first issue of *Shvilin*, he noted: "The work is great and extensive…to fulfill the functions of a professional union – protection of the working rabbi – and up to explicating the laws and customs for the people.”[[19]](#footnote-19)

Rabbi Tchorsh's words were clear and emphatic: the Hever HaRabbanim would operate both as a professional union and also deal with halachic and Torah issues. Rabbi Tchorsh's approach was apparently supported by the majority of the rabbis. The most striking proof of this is the fact that Hever HaRabbanim did engage in "professional union" matters, as we will demonstrate below. One of the rabbis who supported Rabbi Tchorsh's approach was Rabbi Yehuda Gur, head of the rabbinical department at the Ministry of Religion, who spoke at the 8th conference of the Hever HaRabbanim (his words are quoted in *Shivilin*) ​​and explained there why in his opinion the Hever HaRabbanim should also function as a "professional union":

*In times past people could survive as individuals, whether in a profession, or in agriculture, in industry, or in commerce. Today, such things nearly ceased to exist. No farmer can survive if he is not associated with an agricultural organization. No industrialist can last if he is not associated with an organization or industrial association and the same holds true for the merchant. This is all the more applicable when it concerns spiritual, social, or political matters, therefore this organization of the rabbis is very important.[[20]](#footnote-20)*

Rabbi Gur, in effect, compared the need to organize workers in a particular profession to the need for such organization for rabbis, namely, Hever HaRabbanim which is a profession for all intents and purposes. It is no wonder that Rabbi Yisraeli, who led the halakhic line in Hever HaRabbanimin the 1950s, had reservations about turning the Hever HaRabbanim into a professional union.  Rabbi Yisraeli saw the Hever HaRabbanim as a body that should deal only with content and not with "salaries".

Rabbi Tchorsh's approach can be explained by the need to protect the rabbis' rights, even if they are material, since a rabbi is also entitled to earn a living with dignity. It is also possible that Rabbi Tchorsh wanted to create a sort of "division of labor", according to which the Chief Rabbinate would take care of Torah matters while Hever HaRabbanim would support it and help it in these matters as much as possible, while at the same time focusing on the organization of the rabbis and their rights, something that was not within the purview of the Chief Rabbinate.

Indeed, in reality, Hever HaRabbanim acted as a professional union. In the various issues of *Shvilin*, salary tables of rabbis were published and extensive space was devoted to the subject of the rabbis' social rights. Thus, for example:

*The Hever HaRabbanim and the Department of Religion in the Mafdal recently carried out special activity to improve the status of the rabbis, in the cities, in the moshavim, in the villages and in the centers for new immigrants. Hever HaRabbanim submitted proposals to establish a new [salary] ranking for the rabbis in Israel to the government institutions and the professional union. Included in these proposals is the emphatic demand to compare the salary of the rabbis to that of the heads of the local authorities. According to the proposal, the rabbi of a city will receive a salary equivalent to the mayor; in a local council, the rabbi's salary will be equivalent to that of the chairman of the council, etc. In addition, the proposal included claims to guarantee social rights such as vacations, convalescence, pension funds, etc.  [[21]](#footnote-21)*

In another example, in *Shvilin* 4 (Tevet 5773) there is an article about the ranking achieved for the rabbis:

*This ranking, which was achieved as a result of a prolonged public campaign led by Hever HaRabbanim of the movement in collaboration with the trade union department of Hapoel HaMizrachi, corrects to some extent the discrepancies in the rabbis' salaries. For years Hever HaRabbanim has been warning about the outrageous discrimination until they finally were responsive to the just demand.[[22]](#footnote-22)*

In "HaTzofe" the role of Hever HaRabbanim in the struggle for social rights was also described:

*Hever HaRabbanim is perhaps the only body that does not turn its back on this situation of the rabbis' quite meager salary. Hever HaRabbanim's delegates have been knocking on the doors of government institutions and asking that this injustice be corrected. It is possible that in the future Hever HaRabbanim will expand its struggle in this area of ​​improving the status of the rabbis... Those rabbis who are disadvantaged are incapable by their very nature of resorting to the tried and tested methods of announcing strikes to promote their interests. They live their lives in hardship and deprivation, while outwardly trying to maintain their equanimity.[[23]](#footnote-23)*

The functioning of the Hever HaRabbanim as a "professional union" was, as mentioned, to the dismay of Rabbi Yisraeli who aspired to have Hever HaRabbanim deal more with content and less with technical and organizational matters, whereas Rabbi Tchorsh did not see a contradiction in engaging in both areas.

If we connect this topic to the controversy about the essence of the Hever HaRabbanim that we discussed earlier, one can identify the beginnings of the breakdown of Hever HaRabbanim. Rabbi Yisraeli, who objected to the extensive involvement in the organizational issue, objected equally a focus on the partisan aspect of Hever HaRabbanim. Thus was paved the road to division in Hever HaRabbanim after the dismissal of Rabbis Unterman and Nissim from the Chief Rabbinate in 1972. This affair expressed one of the dilemmas faced by a religious and modern party: the question of the attitude toward rabbis.
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